REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated June 3, 2005 and the Advisory Action dated September 21, 2005.

Claim 5 has been amended to even more clearly distinguish the prior art. The amendments to claim 5 are supported by, for example, page 15, line 23 to page 16, line 1 of the original specification and, therefore, do not introduce new matter.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art shown in Fig. 7 and defined on pages 1 and 2 of the specification, in view of Ogden (U.S. Patent No. 4,478,666); claims 2, 4 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art, in view of Ogden, and further in view of Miwa (U.S. Patent No. 4,625,097); claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art in view of Ogden; and claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art, in view of Ogden, and further in view of Miwa.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

By way of review, the present invention, as defined in claim 1, is directed to an equipment utilizing water characterized in that an outer member includes a transparent member, a transparent film formed thereon, and a colored decoration provided on a surface of the transparent member opposite to the transparent film.

As described in Fig. 7 and the specification of the present application, in the applicant's admitted prior art, an outer member 55 is normally made of a colored material and a waterproof film 59 is provided on the outer surface of the colored outer member. Further, decorations are provided on the outer surface of the waterproof film 59. With the prior art configuration, no transparent texture quality can be provided, thereby failing to provide a depth and classic texture quality in design. Moreover, stereovision of characters or figures on an outer surface of the appliance cannot be implemented.

The present invention has been conceived to solve the above problem, and by providing a water-utilizing appliance which offers a transparent ***texture quality*** in outer appearance as well as a depth and classic ***texture quality*** in design and, at the same time, renders characters or figures on a surface of the appliance easily visible by implementing a ***stereovision*** thereof (see page 2, lines 13 to 19 of the specification of the present application).

In contrast, Ogden is directed to a membrane or keyboard switch control panel arrangement and label assembly therefor. Ogden is clearly not directed to any sort of equipment utilizing water or anything similar. Instead, a principal object of Ogden's invention is to provide a control panel arrangement that includes an in field markable legend sheet for identifying the controlling switches and their functions.

In particular, the Ogden patent discloses a legend sheet 16 and a cover sheet 18 that may be formed from transparent Mylar polyester, and also indicates that the back side of the legend sheet, except for the viewing windows defined by

the rings 94, are covered with a contrasting but opaque color, such as yellow, employing a suitable silk screening procedure (see column 8, lines 64 to 68). *Accordingly, Ogden never considers nor obtains the transparent texture quality in outer appearance, the depth and classic texture quality in design, and the stereovision effect made possible by the present invention.*

Further, the present invention, as defined in claim 5, is directed to equipment utilizing water characterized in that an outer member includes a transparent member, a transparent film formed on a top surface of the transparent member, and a colored member integrally formed on a bottom surface of the transparent member, wherein the colored member is connected to a cover of the equipment utilizing water.

In contrast, the applicant's admitted prior art merely discloses an outer member of **two layers** including a colored member 55 and a transparent film 59 on the colored member 55, but does not disclose the outer member of **three layers** including the transparent film, the transparent member and the colored member as in the present invention. **Although the Examiner indicated reference numeral 51 as a colored member, it actually represents an outer case of the equipment** (see page 1, lines 24 to 26 of the specification of the present application).

Specifically, in the present invention, the transparent member is interposed between the transparent film and the colored member to exhibit a transparent texture quality, a depth and classic texture quality, and a stereovision effect, whereas in the applicant's admitted prior art, there is no transparent member between the colored member 55 and the transparent film 59, so that the inventive

effects of the present invention cannot be obtained. Ogden does not make up for this deficiency because it also does not disclose the claimed three layers including a transparent film, transparent member, and colored member, much less the positively recited equipment utilizing water of the present invention wherein an outer member includes a transparent member interposed between a colored member and a transparent film, the colored member being connected to a cover of the equipment.

Moreover, Ogden does not suggest nor teach the transparent texture quality, the depth and classic texture quality, and the stereovision effects exhibited by the present invention, or an arrangement that can possibly achieve those effects.

As described above, the objects and effects of the applicant's admitted prior art and the Ogden's invention are different from those of the present invention, and there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the admitted prior art or to combine the reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, aside from Applicants' own teachings. See, e.g., In re Fritch, 23, USPQ 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("It is impermissible to engage in hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using the applicant's structure as a template and selecting elements from references to fill the gaps").

The Examiner's hindsight combination of the applicant's admitted prior art and Ogden is believed to be entirely improper in the absence of any suggestion, teaching or motivation given in any of the prior art references to do so, as a result of which absence one of ordinary skill the art would have no reason to make such combination.

Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that such combination were proper, such combination still cannot render the present invention obvious because neither the applicant's admitted prior art nor Ogden discloses or even implies the present invention. Accordingly, even if every single disclosure contained in each of the references is selectively chosen and stacked together against the present invention, such combination cannot possibly suggest to an ordinary person in the art the inventive features of the present invention.

Moreover, other cited references also do not disclose the aforementioned inventive features of the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 5 define a patentable invention over the prior art references, including the applicant's admitted prior art and Ogden collectively or individually; and is, therefore, allowable.

It is also believed that claims 2-4 and claim 6-7, depending on claims 1 and 5 respectively, are allowable for the same reasons indicated with respect to claims 1 and 5, and further because of the additional features recited therein which, when taken alone and/or in combination with the features recited in claims 1 and 5, move the invention defined therein further from the disclosures made in the cited references.

As stated above, the prior art references do not show the inventive features of the present invention. Accordingly, it is most respectfully submitted that the claims define patentable inventions over the prior art references and are, therefore, allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this is a full and complete response to the Advisory Action. For the reasons discussed above, applicants now respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in complete condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn; and that claims 1-7 be allowed in their present forms. If the Examiner feels that any issues that remain require discussion, he is kindly invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA

Registration No. 33,805

Date: November 2, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703-683-0500